

REMARKS

The following is the disposition of the claims. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 2-8 have been previously presented.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 112

In the Office Action dated January 24, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above-stated rejection of Applicant's claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is traversed. The Examiner stated in the Office Action that "there is no support for the limitation that the substrate comprises 'a plurality of individual fibers,'" Fig. 14 particularly shows scanning electron microscope (SEM) micrographs of (a) untreated individual cotton fibers and (a) treated individual cotton fibers. In paragraph [0094] the Applicant described that "the micrograph shows that the hydrophobic cotton had a film coated on **the fiber** (emphasis added)." The Applicant further showed in Figs. 14a and 14b individual fibers uncoated and coated. Further, the Applicant described that the admicellar film was coated on "the fiber." This signifies that the admicellar coating can be coated on the individual fibers of the cotton, which make up Applicant's substrate. Applicant would also like to point out that a substrate of cotton is inherently comprised of a plurality of individual fibers.

The Examiner also stated in the Office Action that there is no support for a coated substrate having "an air permeability ratio of at least 95% of the air permeability of an uncoated substrate." This rejection is moot in light of the amendment of claim 1. As the Examiner stated, Table 1 of the Specification shows the air permeability of the untreated, or uncoated, cotton to be 6.94 (cm³/cm²/sec) and the air permeability of the hydrophobic, or coated, cotton to be 7.11. The percent difference between these two air permeabilities can be determined by taking the difference between the two air permeabilities [7.11 – 6.94 = 0.17] and then dividing the difference by the air permeability of the untreated, or uncoated, cotton [(0.17/6.94) * 100 = 2.45%]. The example, just detailed, provides the difference between the air permeabilities to be 0.17 (cm³/cm²/sec) and the percent difference of air permeabilities to be 2.45%. This shows that the air permeability of the substrate having the admicellar hydrophobic polymer coating thereon is substantially the same as the air permeability of an uncoated substrate, as currently claimed in claim 1.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as applicable to the claims now pending in the application.



Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. Therefore, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider each and every rejection as applicable to the claims now pending in the application and pass such claims to issue.

This amendment is intended to be a complete response to the Office Action dated January 24, 2007. In the event that any outstanding issues remain that would delay the allowance of this application, the examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to **telephonically** discuss such outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bryan A. Fuller".

Bryan A. Fuller, Reg. No. 58,065
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.
P.O. Box 16370
Oklahoma City, OK 73113
Customer No. 30589
(405) 607-8600 Office
(405) 607-8686 Facsimile
Attorney for Applicant